



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,554	05/08/2006	Yoshiaki Yamanoi	P08546US00/RFH	5107
881	7590	12/02/2010		
STITES & HARBISON PLLC 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				EXAMINER
				LOFTIS, JOHNNA RONEE
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3624		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/02/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

iplaw@stites.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/521,554	Applicant(s) YAMANOI, YOSHIAKI
	Examiner JOHNNA R. LOFTIS	Art Unit 3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **24 September 2010**.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) **4-7** is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) **4-7** is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a final office action upon examination of application number 10521554. Claims 1-3 are cancelled. Claims 4-7 have been added. Claims 4-7 are pending and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

Response to Amendment

2. All objections and rejections directed to claims 1-3 have been withdrawn since those claims are no longer pending. New rejections have been introduced for claims 4-7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876); *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 IFed. Cir. 2008). Also see USPTO Memoranda, "Guidance for Examining Process Claims in view of *In re Bilski*,"

January 7, 2009 and "New Interim Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Examination Instructions," August 24, 2009. Both memoranda may be located on the USPTO website at:

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/patcnts/memoranda.htm>

There are two corollaries to the machine-or-transformation test. First, a mere field of use limitation is generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patentable. This means the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim's scope to pass the test. Second, insignificant extra solution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. This means reciting a specific machine or particular transformation of a specific article in an insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test. If neither of these requirements are met by the claims, the method is not a patent eligible process under 35 USC 101 and is non-statutory subject matter.

Nominal recitations of structure in an otherwise ineligible method fail to make the method a statutory process. The use of a specific machine or transformation of an article must impose meaningful limits on the claim's scope to impart patent-eligibility. See Benson, 409 U.S at 71-72. Further, the involvement of the machine or transformation in the claimed process must not merely be insignificant extra-solution activity. See Flook, 437 U.S at 590. Incidental physical limitations, such as data gathering, field of use limitations, and extra-solution activity is not enough to convert an abstract idea into a statutory process (*In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385, 1385 (Fed Cir. 2008)). In other words, nominal or token recitations of structure in a method claim do not convert an otherwise ineligible claim into an eligible one. It is further noted that the mere recitation of a machine in the preamble in a manner such that the machine fails to

patentably limit the scope of the claim does not make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101, as seen in the Board of Patent Appeals Informative Opinion *Ex Parte Langemyr et al. (Appeal 2008-1495)*.

Regarding the “transformation” prong, the claimed values represent conceptual and theoretical values. This is different than the discussion of Abele held by Bilski, in which “X-ray attenuation data produced in a two dimensional field by a computed tomography scanner” was deemed to represent physical and tangible objects, because it “clearly represented physical and tangible objects, namely the structure of bones, organs, and other body tissues..... the transformation of that raw data into a particular visual depiction of a physical object on a display”, resulting in a transformation of data that rendered the process patent-eligible. Thus, the claimed invention does not rise to the level of Abele in transforming electronically-manipulated data into patent-eligible subject matter.

Here, applicant’s method steps, fail the first prong since reciting a specific machine or particular transformation of a specific article in an insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test. Similarly, the applicant’s method steps fail the second prong because they do not result in a transformation of subject matter into another state or thing. Thus, claims 4-7 are non-statutory.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Tomoki, Ishizawa; Kazuyoshi, Nakajima. Method of Supporting Work and Device Therefor. Japanese Publication No. 10-301472 Nov.13, 1998
- b. Yoriaki, Yamai. Analyzing Method of Working state, Analysis system of Working State to Execute the Same Method and Managing Device of Working State Using the Same System Japanese Publication No. 2001-014016
- c. Ryuta, Isaka; Shigeru, Uetsume. Work Evaluation Device, Work Evaluation Method and Program to Realize Work Evaluation Method in Computer.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHNNA R. LOFTIS whose telephone number is (571)272-6736. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynda Jasmin can be reached on 571-272-6782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Johnna R Loftis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3624